

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

ROBERT EARL WARREN, JR., Plaintiff, VS. Civil Action No. 4:18-01450-MGL CORPORAL JOEY CARNES/JOSEPH CARNES, OFFICER BRIAN CAMPBELL, SHERIFF JAY L. BROOKS, UNDER SHERIFF ROB LEE, SOLICITOR MARY THOMAS JOHNSON-LEE, WAYNE JORDEN, JIMMY COONS, KEITH THOMAS, JACK HENDERSON, BOBBY DRIGGERS, GEORGE HALMA, SUSAN ALDERMAN, JAMIE SEALS, JOSH WHITE, TREVOR MURPHY, and CLAY § § § § ANDERSON,

Defendants.

## ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO DISMISS

Plaintiff Robert Earl Warren, Jr. (Warren), proceeding pro se, filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his constitutional rights. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Defendants Jimmy Coons, Wayne Jordan, Sheriff Jay L. Brooks, Officer Brian Campbell, Corporal Joey/Joseph Carnes, Solicitor Mary Thomas Johnson-Lee, Clay Anderson, Trevor Murphy, Jamie Seals, and Josh White's (collectively, Defendants) motions to dismiss be granted and Warren's complaint be dismissed for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with the Magistrate's orders. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 18, 2019. To date, Johnson has not filed any objections to the report. "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Defendants' motions to dismiss are **GRANTED** and Warren's complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for lack of prosecution.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 10th day of December 2019 in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis MARY GEIGER LEWIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.